THE LIBERATOR

"COMRADES LET US ALL UNITE."

Vol. 1, No. 20. CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JANUARY 14, 1906. Price, 2 Cents.

PETER KROPOTKIN

His Lecture on "Anarchy in the Evolution of Socialism," Delivered to the Paris Working People.

(Continued from last week.)

But that is communism! you will say. Yes, it is communism; but communism that speaks no longer in the name of religion, no longer in the name of the state, but in the name of the people.

During the last fifty years there has been a formidable awakening among the working classes. The prejudice in favor of private property is disappearing. More and more the worker is accustoming himself to look upon the factory, the railroad, the mine, not as the castle of the feudal age that belonged to some particular lord, but as an institution of public utility that all the world has the right to control.

The idea of common possession has not been elaborated from deduction to deduction by a thinker in his study. It is a thought which is springing up spontaneously in the minds of the working masses. And when the revolution, which the end of this century has in store for us, shall have thrown the camp of the exploiters into disorder you will see that the great masses of the people will demand expropriation and will proclaim that it has a right to the workshop, the factory, the locomotive, and the steamboat.

Just as the sentiment of the inviolability of the domicile, the home, has developed during the second half of our century, so the sentiment of the collective right to all that serves for the production of wealth has developed itself among the masses. It is a fact; and whoever cares to examine, as we do, the life of the people, and to follow its development, will admit that this is but a faithful resume of the aspirations of the people.

Yes, the tendency of the close of the nineteenth century is toward communism; not toward the communism of the convent or of the barracks, that they preached of in former days, but toward free communism, which puts at the disposition of all the products raised or manufactured in common, leaving to each the liberty of consuming them as he pleases in his own home.

This is the solution which the masses of the people find most easy of attainment, the solution which the people turns to in its most solemn hours. In 1848 the formula: "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs," is the one that goes straightest to the hearts of the masses. If they shout for a republic, for universal suffrage, it is because they hope to find communism in its outcome. And in 1871, when Paris is besieged, when the people desires to make a supreme effort to resist the invaders, what is it that it clamors for? Proportional division.

The putting into one pile all provisions and their distribution according to the wants of each. The putting into one pile of all of which there is abundance, the proportional division of whatever is scarce, is the people's solution. This it practices daily in the country. As long as the meadow lands afford sufficient pasture, where is the commune that dreams of limiting the use of them? As long as small timber and chestnuts abound, where is the commune that refuses its members the right of taking what they wish? And when the forests begin to fail, what is it that the peasant proposes? Proportional division. The putting into one pile all the provisions of which there is abundance. The proportional division of all those things of which only a certain amount can be produced, the division being made in accordance with individual wants, preference being given to the children and the aged—to the feeble, in a word. And, finally, consumption; not out of one common pot, but in one's own house, according to each one's individual taste, in the company of one's family or friends. Such is the ideal of the masses whose mouth-pieces we have become.

But it is not enough to say: "Communism, expropriation." We must further know upon whom the management of the common property is to devolve, and it is upon this more than upon any other question that the schools of socialism are divided, those who differ from us desiring authoritative communism, while we for our part declare ourselves frankly in favor of anarchistic communism.

That we may be able to judge these two ideas upon their merits let us go back once more to the point from which we started—the revolution of last century.

In overthrowing royalty the revolution proclaimed the sovereignty of the people. But with an inconsistency which was at the time very natural it proclaimed not its permanent sovereignty, but a sovereignty that was intermittent, that was to be exercised at certain intervals only and to be confined to the nomination of deputies who were supposed to represent the people. At bottom it copied its institutions from the representative government of England.

The revolution was drowned in blood. Nevertheless representative government became the watchword of Europe. The whole of Europe, Russia alone excepted, has tried it in every possible variety of form, from government under the thumb of the censor to the direct government of the little republics of Switzerland.

But, and this is strange, in proportion as we approach the ideal representative government, elected by universal suffrage that is absolutely free, so do we discover its essential vices. Let us understand that this method of government is rotten at the root.

In truth, is it not absurd to pick out from the population a certain number of men and to intrust to them the care of all public affairs, telling them: "Do you attend to these things; we shoulder the charge on you. You have to make the laws for us on all subjects—armaments and mad dogs, observatories and chimney pipes, education and street-sweeping. Arrange matters as you think best and pass laws accordingly, for you are the ones whom the people have elected as the proper persons to attend to everything."

I do not know, fellow citizens, but it seems to me that if one came to offer any serious man such a part as this he ought to reply pretty nearly as follows: "Fellow citizens, you are confiding to me a trust that I cannot possibly fulfill. I know nothing about most of the subjects upon which I shall be called to make laws. Either I shall have to act blindly, and you cannot gain by that, or I must apply to you and summon meetings, in which you will have to attempt to come to an understanding on the question, and in that event my part becomes a useless one. If you yourselves have formed an opinion and put it into proper shape, if you wish to come to an arrangement with other citizens who have also formed an opinion upon the matter in hand, then you can in a very simple fashion proceed to exchange ideas with your neighbors, and send a delegate who will be able to come to terms with the other delegates upon this special question; but, of course, you will reserve for yourselves the final decision. You will not intrust him with the care of making your laws. It is thus that the savants, the business men act whenever they have to come to an understanding on questions of general interest."

But this would be the negation of the representative regime, of government, and of the state. This is the idea at present springing up everywhere, now that the vices of representative government, exposed in their nakedness, have become so crying.

Our century has gone still farther. It has brought under discussion the rights of the state and of society in their relation to the individual. The question is asked how far the interference of the state in the thousand and one functions of society is necessary.

Do we really require a government to instruct our children? Let the toiler but have leisure to educate himself and you will see how everywhere there will spring up, through the free initiative of the parents, persons who are fond of teaching, thousands of educational societies, schools of every kind, rivaling one another in the superiority of the education they offer. If we were not crushed down with taxes and robbed by our employers as we are, should we not know how to do this infinitely better ourselves? The great centers would step forward and take the initiative, preaching by example, and the progress realized—no one can doubt it—would be comparably superior to that which we succeed in getting from our ministers.

Is the state even necessary for territorial defense? If armed brigands come to the attack of a free people, that people armed, well equipped, is it not the surest rampart you can oppose to foreign attack? Standing armies are always being overcome by invaders, and—history is there to prove it—if they are ever driven back it is only by a general uprising of the people.

Excellent as a machine for the protection of monopoly, has government ever been able to protect us against the few among us who are inclined to do evil? By creating misery does it not augment the number of crimes instead of diminishing them? In creating prisons in which whole populations of men and children are swallowed up, only to issue forth infinitely worse than when they entered, does not the state keep up, at the expense of the taxpayers, nurseries of vice?

In forcing us to commit to others the care of our affairs does it not create the most fearful vice that can afflict society—indifference to public matters?

And, on the other hand, if we analyze all the grand steps in advance that our century has taken—our international traffic, our industrial discoveries, our means of communication—is it to the state or to private enterprise that we owe them?

Look at the net-work of railroads that covers the face of Europe. At Madrid, for example, you take a ticket direct for Petersburg. You roll over roads that have been constructed by millions of workers set in motion by scores of companies; Spanish, French, Bavarian, Russian locomotives will come to draw your car. You roll along without the loss at any point of twenty minutes, and the 200 francs that you have paid at Madrid will be equitably distributed, almost to a sou, among the companies that have contributed to your journey.

Well, this line from Madrid to Petersburg has been constructed of little isolated pieces that have been joined together bit by bit. The through trains is the result of an understanding between twenty different companies. I know that at first there was considerable jangling; that the companies, urged on by a stupid selfishness, were not willing to come to terms with one another. But I ask you: Which was best—to undergo a few of these janglings, or to wait until a Bismarck, a

(Continued on Page 3.)

THE ANARCHIST SPEECHES

In No. 16 of The Liberator were commenced the publication of the speeches of the Anarchists, delivered in court in Chicago on Oct. 7, 8 and 9, 1887, when asked why sentence of death should not be pronounced upon them. These speeches are their reply. It was their last message to the world and must prove interesting and instructive reading to the most prejudiced as well as the most sympathetic. Instructive to the prejudiced-minded, because no person capable of clear reasoning powers can read these speeches and lay them down, and then, allowing the innermost recesses of his heart to speak, he must say, "Those men were innocent of the crime for which they suffered death." They were victims of class hatred.

ALBERT R. PARSONS' SPEECH.

Your Honor:

If there is one distinguishing characteristic which has made itself prominent in the conduct of this trial it has been the passion, the heat, and the anger, the violence both to sentiment and to person, of everything connected with this case. You ask me why sentence of death should not be pronounced upon me, or, what is tantamount to the same thing, you ask me why you should give me a new trial in order that I might establish my innocence and the ends of justice be subserved. I answer you and say that this verdict is the verdict of passion, born in passion, nurtured in passion, and is the sum total of the organized passion of the city of Chicago. For this reason I ask your suspension of the sentence, and a new trial. This is one among the many reasons which I hope to present before I conclude. Now, what is passion? Passion is the suspension of reason; in a mob upon the streets, in the broils of the saloon, in the quarrels on the sidewalk, where men throw aside their reason and resort to feelings of exasperation, we have passion. There is a suspension of the elements of judgment, of calmness, of discrimination requisite to arrive at the truth and the establishment of justice. I hold that you cannot dispute the charge which I make, that this trial has been submerged, immersed in passion from its inception to its close, and even to this hour, standing here upon the scaffold as I do, with the hangman awaiting me with his halter, there are those who claim to represent public sentiment in this city—and I now speak of the capitalistic press, that vile and infamous organ of monopoly, of hired liars, the people's oppressor—even to this day these papers, standing where I do, with my seven condemned colleagues, are clamoring for our blood in the heat and violence of passion. Who can deny this? Certainly not this Court. The Court is fully aware of these facts.

In order that I may place myself properly before you, it is necessary, in vindication of whatever I may have said or done in the history of my past life, that I should enter somewhat into details, and I claim, even at the expense of being lengthy, the ends of justice require that this shall be done.

For the past twenty years my life has been closely identified with, and I have actively participated in, what is known as the labor movement in America. I have some knowledge of that movement in consequence of this experience and of the careful study which opportunity has afforded me from time to time to give to the matter, and in what I have to say upon this subject relating to the labor movement, or to myself as connected with it in this trial and before this bar, I will speak the truth, the whole truth, be the consequences what they may.

The United States census for 1880 reports that there are in the United States 16,200,000 wage-workers. These are the persons who, by their industry, create all the wealth of this country. And now before I say anything further it may be necessary, in order to clearly understand what I am going to state further on, for me to define what I mean and what is meant in the labor movement by these words, wage-worker. A wage-worker is one who works for wages and who has no other means of subsistence than by the selling of his daily toil from hour to hour, day to day, week to week, month to month, and year to year, as the case may be. Their whole property consists entirely of their labor, strength and skill—or rather, they possess nothing but empty hands. They live only when afforded an opportunity must be procured from the possessors of the means of subsistence — capital — before their right to live at all or the opportunity to do so is possessed. Now, there are 16,200,000 of these people in the United States, according to the census of 1880. Among this number are 9,000,000 men, and reckoning five persons to each family, they represent 45,000,000 of our population. It is claimed that there are between eleven and twelve millions of voters in the United States. Now, out of these 12,000,000, 9,000,000 of these voters are wage-workers. The remainder of the 16,200,000 is composed of the women, boys, and girls—the children—employed in the factories, the mines, farms, and the various avocations of this country. The class of people — the producing class — who alone do all the productive labor of this country, are the hirelings and dependents of the propertied class.

Your honor, I have, as a workingman, espoused what I conceive to be the just claims of the working class; I have defended their right to liberty and insisted upon their right to control their own labor and the fruits thereof, and in the statement that I am to make here before this Court upon the question why I should not be sentenced, or why I should be permitted to have a new trial, you will also be made to understand why there is a class of men in this country who come to your honor and appeal to you not to grant us a new trial. I believe, sir, that the representatives of that millionaire organization of Chicago, known as the Chicago Citizens' Association, stand to a man demanding of your honor our immediate extinction and suppression by an ignominious death.

Now, I stand here as one of the people, a common man, a workingman, one of the masses, and I ask you to give ear to what I have to say. You stand as a bulwark; you are as a brake between them and us. You are here as the representative of justice, holding the poised scales in your hands. You are expected to look neither to the right nor to the left, but to that by which justice, and justice alone, shall be subserved. The conviction of a man, your honor, does not necessarily prove that he is guilty. Your law books are filled with instances where men have been carried to the scaffold and after their death it has been proven that their execution was a judicial murder. Now, what end can be subserved in hurrying this matter through in the manner in which it has been done? Where are the ends of justice subserved, and where is truth found in hurrying seven human beings at the rate of express speed upon a fast train to the scaffold and an ignominious death? Why, if your honor please, the very methods of our extermination, the deep damnation of its taking off, appeals to your honor's sense of justice, of rectitude, and of honor. A judge may also be an unjust man. Such things have been known. We have, in our histories, heard of Lord Jeffreys. It need not follow that because a man is a judge he is also just. As everyone knows, it has long since become the practice in American politics for the candidates for judgeships throughout the United States to be named by corporation and monopoly influences, and it is a well-known secret that more than one of our Chief Justices have been appointed to their seats upon the bench of the United States Supreme Court at the instance of the leading railway magnates of America—the Huntingtons and Jay Goulds. Therefore the people are beginning to lose confidence in some of our courts of law.

Now, I have not been able to gather together and put in a consecutive shape these thoughts which I wish to present here for your consideration. They have been put together hurriedly in the last few days, since we began to come in here—first, because I did not know what you would do, nor what the position of your honor would be in the case; and secondly, because I did not know upon what ground the deduction of the prosecution would be made denying us the right of a rehearing, and, therefore, if the method of the presentation of this matter be somewhat disconnected and disjointed, it may be ascribed to that fact, over which I have had no control.

I maintain that our execution, as the matter stands just now, would be a judicial murder, rank and foul, and judicial murder is far more infamous than lynch law—far worse. Bear in mind, please, this trial was conducted by a mob, prosecuted by a mob, by the shrieks and the howls of a mob—an organized, powerful mob. But that trial is now over. You sit here judicially, calmly, quietly, and it is now for you to look at this thing from the standpoint of reason and common sense. There is one peculiarity about the case that I want to call your attention to. It is the manner and the method of its prosecution! On the one side, the attorneys for the prosecution conducted this case from the standpoint of capitalists as against laborers. On the other side, the attorneys for the defence conducted this case as a defence against murder—not for laborers and not against capitalists.

The prosecution in this case throughout has been a capitalistic prosecution, inspired by the instinct of capitalism, and I mean by that by class feelings, by a dictatorial right to rule, and a denial to common people the right to say anything or have anything to say to these men, by that class of persons who think that working people have but one right and one duty to perform, viz.: Obedience. They conducted this trial from that standpoint throughout, and, as was very truthfully stated by my comrade Fielden, we were prosecuted ostensibly for murder until near the end of the trial, when all at once the jury is commanded — yea, commanded — to render a verdict against us as Anarchists.

Your honor, you are aware of this; you know this to be the truth; you sat and heard it all.

(Continued on Page 3.)

THE LIBERATOR

A Weekly Devoted to Revolutionary Propaganda Along Lines of Anarchistic Thought.

Published by
LIBERATOR PUBLISHING GROUP.
EDW. GREENBAUM, Sec'y,
466 Van Buren St.

Subscriptions $1.00 per year in advance. Six months, 50c. Single copies, 2c each.
LUCY E. PARSONS, Editor,
466 W. Van Buren St.,
Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Postoffice at Chicago, Ill., as second class matter.

The Editor does not necessarily indorse all views expressed by contributors but as THE LIBERATOR is a free Forum we invite and welcome contributions upon all subjects pertaining to liberalism.

Personalities will be rigidly excluded; we are working for the good of humanity at large.

PATRIOTISM.

Love for home, for the spot around which cluster tenderest reminiscences of youth, where childhood's happy years were passed, and with which we associate sacred memories of loved ones, this is one of the sweetest sentiments conceived. We Anarchists strive for the extension of this sentiment to the larger home, to the association of those speaking a common language, having common interests and wants, and sharing the same joys and sorrows, where a common race and a common humanity blend into a harmonious whole; a humanity that shall have outgrown the superstition of the need for governments with their special privileges, their privileged classes, their hindrances, rules and regulations; but instead, a society wherein each adult individual shall be a sovereign unto themselves. In such a society may we indeed hope to produce real patriots and sow the seeds of real patriotism in every heart. Then the nation will be but the extension of the home principle, and it will be guarded with the same solicitude that we at the present time guard happy homes. Into this New Age we are surely growing. A new literature is being written and added to all the time. The public mind is being trained into new channels of thought. This tells upon society and evolves a new conscience.

Can a real patriotism exist under our present conditions? No. It is only a sham, a fake, and artificial. The great mass of the people have neither home nor country to love or defend. Home should be a hallowed spot, where cling the tenderest memories of childhood's tender years, where the watchful care of a mother's love directed the tottering feet of baby dear, and watched her tender flowers grow and develop, and sometimes watered them with her tears.

When these flowers reach the age of maturity, they often scatter over the world. Home should be made so beautiful, so pleasant, so idealistic, that the child's mind could always wander back to it as a sacred place of pleasant dreams. Such, alas, is not the case now, nor cannot be under our unjust arrangements of society.

Children are growing to maturity whose young years are associated with want; where home was a tenement in which discord and penury ruled, where early years were associated with factory life, where a father's smile and a mother's love were overcast by care. Scrimping, anxiety and nervous exhaustion were too often present. True, there is a certain sordid selfishness, a thin veneering of sickly sentiment in what we are pleased to call home and country at the present time. "My country, 'tis of thee," becomes a "sounding brass and tinkling cimble." Its real owners are a lot of hard, relentless, driving task-masters; it is not the abode of a free, sovereign people.

In fact, no one can have a deep-seated interest in anything in which they have no part. The most stupid of every land must realize that they own no part in the country in which they live, that they are landless, dependent hirelings, merely existing upon the pleasure and sweet will of another class. Some day the people, the "common" people, will conclude that it is not an evidence of patriotism to go out and fight and die by thousands upon battle fields and pass through all the horrors of war for a country in which they own no share. There is no real basis for real patriotism among the masses.

L. E. P.

WHAT IS ANARCHY?

V.

My last article on this subject closed with the suggestion that history not only shows foreign conquest to have been most easily effected when the country conquered had a strong government, and most effectually checked when it encountered Anarchy, but also shows that anarchy has the advantage of government in "offensively defensive war"; that is where a nation seeks to protect itself from foreign conquest by retaliating or anticipating invasion.

The examples of such war as this are very numerous, and go back to the remotest antiquity. Probably the oldest recorded example is the expulsion of the Hyksos from Egypt. The Hyksos, kings of a people whose few surviving names indicate an Aryan origin, subdued all Egypt, as Manetho relates, **without a battle**; though it had a powerful military caste, and though the character of the monuments indicates that the government was united. The XVIII dynasty of Egyptian kings, who expelled the Hyksos, was founded by mere refugees, above the cataract and frontier of Syene. Their retaliatory conquest of the Hyksos' native country or stepping-stone, in Syria, etc., continued till Rameses II. in the XIX. dynasty, raised the monarchy to its highest splendor, immediately after which we find it going to pieces, an event of which the Hebrew Exodus, though far from reliable history, is our most striking and familiar account.

Passing over the meager records of Asiatic kingdoms previous to Persia, of which the facts are too obscure to assist in generalization, we find that the anarchial Greek state of Athens, after the expulsion of her tyrant, Hippias, whom Persia favored, anticipated the attack of this mighty empire by burning its important city of Sardis; and that, having chiefly decided the war which followed, by her victories at Marathon and Salamis, it was she who followed up the success, taking Cyprus and the Asiatic coast of the Ægaean from Persia, and exacting the Peace of Callias; long after Sparta, a state with a strong government, had had quite enough of it, and set herself to pursuing schemes of tyranny over other Greeks. This Sparta had the strongest of Greek governments, because her system rested on a sort of slavery (helotism), while elsewhere the slaves were too few to require much repression. Her constitution, though formally monarchial, was in fact largely democratic, the real power belonging to a royal cabinet of five officials (Ephors), who were but plain citizens annually elected. For a long time she was very successful; but the remark has already been made that her institutions were too slow and conservative for such success; which was always the work of individual Spartans, acting as volunteers abroad. Every one of these (few) great Spartans, Brasidas, Gylippus, Lysander, Agesilaus, became great and successful when he got out of the claws of the Ephors—not before. Their memorable exploits at Amphipolis, Syracuse, Ægospotami, and in Asia Minor, were what made the greatness of Sparta. All, except perhaps the last, which ended unfortunately, were typical examples of what I have called offensively defensive war.

It was Lysander's victory at Ægospotami which made Sparta, for a time, the ruler of all Greece. Athens, the first state to break loose from her empire, had been betrayed by her own government under Theramenes, a man who would deserve to be considered one of the most infamous in history if his martyrdom for opposing later excesses of tyranny had not partially redeemed his fame. Her restoration was effected by a handful of refugees from Thebes, which had become jealous of Spartan power—a signal example of the offensively defensive kind.

But perhaps the most memorable such war was that in which the Theban Epamoinondas crushed the Spartan empire within a few weeks. After his victory at Leuctra he was urged by the people of Arcadia and other countries groaning under Spartan tyranny, to assist them and to strike at the heart of the hydra in Sparta itself. He risked his life by consenting; for several weeks at a distance from his province would be necessary, and it was a capital offense for a Greek general to overstep his powers, unless success were held to justify it. Taking the responsibility, Epaminondas marched almost unresisted through the proper territory of Sparta, organized the revolted states of Arcadia and Messenia, provided them with fortresses which proved secure, and returned home leaving the lately omnipotent Sparta reduced to a shadow whose continued existence appeared doubtful.

In the military history of Rome, there are some memorable examples. During the first Punic war the Romans lost in succession four fleets, altogether fourteen hundred large vessels, mostly by shipwreck. The discouraged Senate refused to build any more. The fleet which won the decisive victory at the Ægatian Islands was constructed by private subscription. In the Second Punic war the Roman government declined to attempt completing its success by sending an army into Africa while Hannibal remained in Italy. The army which Scipio took over into Carthagian territory, with the immediate result of recalling Hannibal, consisted in volunteers whom the Senate merely refrained from hindering. During the long period between the fall of the Roman Republic and the French Revolution, there are few examples of offensively defensive war. It is worth remarking (1) that this was eminently the age of strong arbitrary governments, and (2) that the few examples of such war which we do find were mostly waged by people contending for their liberties. Switzerland, a most disorganized and anarchical country, defended herself against Austria largely by attack. So did the Hussites of Bohemia. So did the Scotch, a people singularly anarchical during the Middle Ages, in their long struggle for independence against England. The victory of the Dutch over their Spanish invaders was very largely won at sea, by attacking the Spanish colonies. The English, a comparatively free people, successfully pursued the same policy, when their independence was threatened by the then mighty empire of Phillip II. The most signal example in modern times is the wave of French invasion which rolled the forces of the Coalition back, overflowing Belgium, Holland, Spain and Italy. When France herself had become conqueror and tyrant, her overthrow was largely effected by Russians and Germans, retaliating with right good will her invasion of their country. One of these nations—the Germans—rose in what they vainly styled the War of Liberation, after their wretched governments had provoked and succumbed to Napoleon. The Russians, it is true, were under a victorious despotism, but there is some significance in the fact that for retaliatory purposes, its principal force was the nomadic Cossacks, whose local institutions are free, and with whom the government at St. Petersburg interferes less than almost any other of its subjects.

There is no denying that offensively defensive war has sometimes been waged successfully by a government as arbitrary as that threatening it. Perhaps the most striking example is the invasion of Austria by Frederick the Great, when he discovered she was at the head of a vast conspiracy for his overthrow. Such war has also sometimes been undertaken by kings with unfortunate results; as when the king of Granada anticipated what proved the fatal attack of the Spaniards under Ferdinand and Isabella. And sometimes it has been fatal to people as little governed as, or less governed than, those whose attack they feared. Very notable examples are the Confederates' firing on Fort Sumpter, where they knew there would soon be a United States' fleet; and the Boers committing themselves by an ultimatum, to attack England unless she would abandon preparations to attack them. What such examples tend to prove, when viewed in fair connection with the other phenomena here noticed is that **the more the character of war becomes offensive, the more favorable do its results appear to government as compared with Anarchy.** The great superiority of the latter for purely defensive war has been abundantly illustrated. For aggressive-defensive war it still, on the whole, seems more successful than government, though not as much more successful as for purely defensive. The argument will be complete if we find that for simple aggression, robbery and conquest, government succeeds better than Anarchy. Because these will then be the only purposes for which we can admit it does.

C. L. James.

THREAT OF A STRIKE.

Situation in the Anthracite Field.

Will there be a strike in the anthracite coal fields after April 1, 1906?

After nearly a year of hard revival work in these fields John Mitchell succeeded in rebuilding the union so that in the Shamokin convention, held Dec. 14 last, there was the largest representative attendance ever known in the fields. District No. 1 (Scranton field) came to the convention with 350 delegates entitled to cast 560 votes, or one vote for each 100 members or fraction above fifty, the actual membership represented being 55,000 members. District No. 7 (Hazleton), with 105 delegates, had 156 votes, representing 15,600 men. District No. 9 (Shamokin), with 240 delegates, had 374 votes for 37,900 men. The convention thus was made up of 695 delegates, casting 1,090 votes, expressive of the will of 108,500 organized mine workers.

By shrewd manipulation, under the master hand of John Mitchell, the convention formulated no positive, irrevocable demands, but stated its grievances and left everything to a committee, which will try to bring about a conference with the employers. The miners themselves have no grievances this year. There has never been another year when they were treated so well or made so much money. But the actual miners are a small part of the labor population and their condition is not the key to the situation at all.

There are in the anthracite coal mines, taking first the inside or underground workers, 39,848 miners, 31,217 miners' laborers, 11,607 drivers and runners, 9,186 company men, 3,173 door boys and helpers, 953 pump men, 901 fire bosses and assistants, 407 mine foremen, 296 assistant mine foremen and 12,774 other employes, making a total of 110,362 underground workers. Outside or above-ground workers are 12,128 slate pickers (breaker boys) and 5,599 slate pickers (old and crippled men.) There are 5,240 engineers and firemen, 2,518 blacksmiths and carpenters, 681 bookkeepers and clerks, 341 foremen, 142 superintendents and 24,319 who are bunched together as "all other employes," making 50,968 above-ground employes, a grand total of 161,330 employed in anthracite coal mining.

The trouble is with those concealed under that waste-basket phrase "all others" among the above-ground men. There are 24,319 of them. They receive, it is claimed by President Dettrey of mine workers' district No. 7, wages ranging from $1.17 to $1.50 a day. "It is undeniable," he says, "that the outside men employed at the various collieries do not receive an amount sufficient to enable a man to live under existing high prices of commodities. These are the men who have been the mainstay of the union and there are no less than 6,000 of them in the Shamokin district."

These men were ruled out of the award by the anthracite commission on a technicality by Commissioner Carrol D. Wright. The union officials and the employers believed the award covered them, but subsequently a phrase was discovered upon which the employers sought a decision to exclude these "rock men and others" from the award. They were sustained, and these men have had no increase in wages whatever as a result of the strike in 1902. They must be given an increase April 1, 1906, or undoubtedly there will be a strike of the entire anthracite coal field.

The breaker boys and the old and crippled men, who do the same work of slate picking get 75 cents a day, but these will not be so seriously involved in the controversy as to cause a strike on their account. These boys present the most serious sociological problem, apart from woman labor, in the coal fields of Pennsylvania. Owen R. Lovejoy, assistant secretary of the national child-labor committee, said in a report dated Dec. 7, 1905: "It is estimated that before the passage of the law last year there were not less than 9,000 to 10,000 boys under 14 years of age working in the breakers. A study of the field last month failed to show any important improvement since the passage of the law."

The eight-hour demand is serious, but hardly dangerous, since the miners themselves work less than eight hours now. In the face of the eight-hour demand comes another from the employers' side for a law to compel the miner to stay in the mines as long as his laborer is in the mine loading the coal. This is with a view to protecting life, on the theory that the miner would be better able to guard against danger.

The death rate from accidents is frightful. There were 496 mine workers killed inside the mines in the year and ninety-nine killed above ground, making a total of 595. In the entire Illinois coal fields in the same time there were 157 killed. The non-fatal accidents in the anthracite field numbered 1,047, in Illinois 507. The 595 killed in the anthracite field left 323 widows and 753 orphans.

The popular idea that the killing is due to the ignorance of a low class of foreigners employed does not seem to be borne out by the facts. For instance, 225 out of the 595 killed were English-speaking people, as follows: One hundred and thirty-five Americans, thirty-eight Irish, twenty-three English, twenty-six Welsh, three Scotch. The others were: One hundred and sixty-six Poles, forty Lithuinians, thirty-eight Slavonians, thirty-five Italians, twenty-five Hungarians, twenty-one Austrians, eighteen Germans, two Swedes, one Greek and one Canadian. The number of tons of coal produced per fatal accident is 110,436, while in Illinois it is 236,165. The product per man employed inside the mine is 667 tons, as against 790 in bituminous mining in Illinois. On the average about one and one-half tons of anthracite is produced for each pound of dynamite used.

The conciliation board has settled nearly every dispute without much trouble. It made two frightful mistakes. One was the exclusion of rockmen from the sliding scale and the other was the unrestricted right of discharge without cause by the employers.

There is but one thing that can be said with absolute certainty, and that is the outside men getting $1.17 and from that to $1.50 a day must not only get a raise but must be included in the sliding scale, or there will be a strike. —John Masterson in Daily News.

GRAND OFFER!

Attention Comrades and Subscribers!

LIFE OF ALBERT R. PARSONS FREE.

Any person sending in five yearly subscribers with money ($5.00) will receive by return mail one copy of this valuable book. See ad on 4th page of this paper. Now, comrades, get to work and you will soon have a book free. Add 15c for postage.

ANARCHIST DEMANDS

Demands adopted by the International Congress of Anarchists, at Pittsburg, Pa., 1883, are as follows:

"What we would achieve is, therefore, plainly and simply:

"First—Destruction of the existing class rule by all means, i. e., by energetic, relentless, revolutionary and international action.

"Second — Establishment of a free society based upon co-operative organization of production.

"Third — Free exchange of equivalent products by and between the productive organizations without commerce and profit mongery.

"Fourth—Organization of education on a secular, scientific and equal basis for both sexes.

"Fifth—Equal rights for all, without distinction to sex or race.

"Sixth—Regulation of all public affairs by free Communes and associations, resting on a federalistic basis.

"Whoever agrees with this idea let him grasp our brothers' outstretched hands!"

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

Fellow-workingmen, all we need for the achievement of this great end is organization and unity!

The day has come for solidarity! Join our ranks. Let the drum beat defiantly the roll of battle! Workingmen of all countries, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains, you have a world to win!

We propose to allow the above demands to stand in The Liberator and we invite discussions upon their merits or demerits.

BOOKS

Loves Coming of Age ..... Edward Carpenter	$1.00
Evolution of the Family..... Jonathan Mayo Crane	.05
Conduct and Profession..... Clarence S. Darrow	.10
Crime and Criminals..... "	.10
Realism in Literature and Art.. "	.05
Resist Not Evil. Cloth..... "	.75
Tolstoy ..... "	.10
Crime and Punishment ..... Voltairine de Cleyre	.10
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth ..... Leo Tolstoy	.30

AT AUTH'S BARBER SHOP, 87½ WELLS ST., YOU GET A GOOD HYGIENIC SHAVE AND FIRST CLASS LAUNDRY WORK. GIVE US A TRIAL.

Joe Hantman and Cily Mayerson.

RESTAURANT

GOOD MEALS SERVED AT LOW PRICES.
247 W. 12th St. CHICAGO.

J. H. GREER, M. D.
52 Dearborn Street.
Office Hours, 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.
Wed. and Sat. till 8.
Sundays 9 to 12 CHICAGO
TEL. MARKET 1344

LIFE IS SO ETERNAL, AND CANNOT DIE.

One planet dies, another born;
Life springs from out decay,
Else why can Nature life restore?
Whence all things pass away.

This earth of ours seems but a blot;
On Nature's written page—
Only a disc to mark the spot
From age, to endless age.

The elements in sea and air
Commingling with the earth
Give life to all things here below,
Ere Nature gave it birth.

Life, all-existent in itself
Throughout all time to be;
No first beginning, nor no end—
Life is eternity.

In every breath of wind that blows
Some life bursts forth at will
To dwell in little nook, or love
Some sphere in life to fill.

Then, what is life, you well might ask
Of me, whose proof forswear
That life, though nurtured by the earth
First breathed forth in the air.

Life is the lightning's flash at play
Ere yet the thunder's sound
Breaks forth from out the darkening clouds
Which shakes the very ground.

Life is the elements combined—
The earth, the air, the sea,
From out the essence life springs forth
Through all eternity.

—S. J. Prisk.

Have you noticed that the Tsar didn't even mention compensation when he turned over that landed property of his to his peasants?

LOVE, THE MEASURE OF THE VITAL ENERGIES OF A PEOPLE.

(By Max Nordau.)

(Continued from last week.)

The impulse of self-preservation in mankind thus leads to the inevitable decay of families founded on loveless and selfish unions.

The universally conceded rapid decay of aristocratic houses has hardly any other cause than this. In addition to the marriages of this kind contracted by "degenerates," there are also those entered into by sound, normal beings, capable of love, who yet have married without love from a lack of understanding, from heedlessness or from a cowardly dread of dangers of the struggle for existence in the midst of organized and governed by sheer egotism. It is remarkable that such marriages, contracted in direct opposition to nature and reason. The sin they have thus committed against that fundamental law, sexual selection, is avenged upon them sooner or later, and the later the more severely. The impulse to love cannot be eradicated from their hearts and is continually seeking an outlet through the unyielding walls of legal and social conventionalism, with incessant and most painful exertion. It may happen that such an individual never meets one with whom it has an affinity, throughout its entire life career; in this case the marriage remains undisturbed and the relations between man and wife united from prudential motives, formally correct. But their existence is unfinished and unsatisfactory; they always have the tormenting sensation of a sorrowful unrest and expection; they are always hoping for something yet to come that will awaken from the stupor of their empty lives. The whole being is felt to be fragmentary and they long for their missing portion, but never find it even in the most brilliant gratifications of their vanity or self-interest, because love alone could supply it.

The lives of such persons, as well as the lives of "degenerates," miss the consecration of the ideal. But, more subjectively unhappy than the latter, they have a continual consciousness of what is lacking.

They are not blind, but seeing men deprived of the light. This is the case if destiny does not bring them in contact with some being with whom they have an affinity. But if they meet with such an one the catastrophe is inevitable. The conflict between conjugal duties and the elementary striving for union with the individual for whom they feel an affinity, is constant and wearing, the substance, the love, rebels against the form, the married state, in which it is confined. Either the substance is crushed or the form is destroyed.

A third solution is also possible and as it is the most ignoble, it is most frequently employed: the sides of the form which are visible to all eyes remain undisturbed, but in the near a narrow crack is made through which the substance can find its way out. To express it more practically, the loving party in the loveless marriage either dissolves the by-force, or struggles with and subdues his love by the sacrifice of his life's happiness, or else spouse and breaks his conjugal vows in secret. Common natures seize at once upon this last means of escape, but natures of true nobility have to struggle through and bear with the tragedy of rebellion against the prejudices of society and the fatal contest between passion and duty with all their bitter intensity. If society were founded upon the laws governing the species, such loveless marriages would be impossible and such catastrophes inconceivable. If it were organized upon the basis of organic laws and solidarity, it would take sides with the lovers and cry to them: "You love, therefore be united." But society officially, is the enemy of the species and is only ruled by egotism; it therefore takes sides with the conjugal duties and says to the contestants: "Renounce each other." But as, in spite of its unnatural conditions, it has retained the knowledge that this is impossible, that it is as easy to renounce love itself is love, and that a revolting command would not be obeyed any more than an order to commit suicide, it adds in a whisper and with a sly wink: "or at least do not give any cause for scandal." Thus love gets it right at last, but only from those who are willing to accept the hypocricy of society, so that, instead of elevating and enobling the character it becomes under such conditions a cause of its deterioration as it requires constant lying, perjury, dissonulation. A curious classification of individualities is produced by its operation in wedded life; the best and finest characters, exactly those which have the most value for the race as breeding material, are the very ones who seem to accept any immoral and vulgar compromises, and as they will not break the solemn vows they pledged at the altar and have perhaps neither the decision nor means to openly and legally dissolve the marriage contract, the love that has entered into their lives too late is the cause of their ruin, and thus is of no benefit to the race; the everyday natures, on the other hand, whose perpetuation is of slight importance to the race, avoid the pain of martyrdom and satisfy their hearts at the expense of their ethical conscience.

The conventional marriage, nine times out of ten, as contracted among the civilized people of Europe, is hence a deeply immoral relation fraught with the most fatal results for the future of society. It compels those who enter into it to find themselves involved sooner or later in a conflict between foresworn vows and indestructable love, and gives them only two alternatives, vulgarity or ruin. Instead of its being a source for our kind to renew its youth, it is a means of its slow suicide.

(To be continued.)

THE REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA.

(Letter addressed by Peter Kropotkin to the Great Meeting held at "Wonderland," Whitechapel, on November 3, 1905.)

Comrades:—When you decided to convoke this meeting, the revolutionary movement in Russia was only just beginning. And tonight we can already speak of the first victory of the Russian people.

True, that up till now the net result of the victory consists chiefly of promises. And promises of the Russian Czar can as easily be broken as were broken the promises which the Austrian Emperor gave to his people after the Vienna insurrection of March 18, 1848.

However, the main point is that these promises were **wrested by the people.** And still more so that they were wrested by means of a **general strike.** And therefore the general strike, which yesterday was considered an impossibility, has proved to be so powerful a weapon for the revolution that the working men of other countries in Europe and America surely will not fail to resort to it.

What is most promising in the Russian movement is that the people has not been misled by mere promises.

At St. Petersburg, at Moscow, at Warsaw, and in all other cities it was understood at once that only certain vague promises of certain political rights had been given; but that nothing had yet been made, or even said, which would give a hope of a new departure in the economical life of the peasants and the working men. And even as regards the political promises, the Romanoffs, till now, have given no pledge of their sincerity.

In Western Europe, each time the ruling classes endeavored to make peace with the people, and intended to assert that a new move in politics was going to be made, they promulgated a general amnesty. Not longer ago than last Monday they have done something similar in France; and so it was done always and everywhere. But till now in Russia our brothers remain imprisoned—over twenty years already—in that terrible Russian Bastile, the Schlusselburg fortress.

What fete of Liberty can there be so long as our brothers remain in Schlusselburg and in the jails all over Russia? When more than 20,000 persons are still in exile, in the hamlets of the Far East and the Far North, in Russia and Siberia!

There is no need to write long-worded laws to put an end to this. A long-worded amnesty is no amnesty at all; it is a lie! A real amnesty can be written in three or four lines:—All condemned for political crimes, for strikes, for agrarian disturbances, for armed resistance, and for breach of laws about military service, strikes, press, etc., are set free. All prosecutions for such affairs are terminated. That is all.

But this unavoidable first step has not yet been made. No pledge of sincerity has yet been given. And if the amnesty is not enforced upon them, they won't give it.

Then all promises of political liberties will remain a dead letter so long as garrisons of from twenty to fifty thousand men remain in the big towns. Not only the state of siege, great and small, has to be abolished at once (and again this does not require long-worded laws), but the garrisons must not remain in the cities. They are a menace to the people. Eighty thousand of the Guard of St. Petersburg are the stronghold of autocracy and of all political oppression.

At the same time they are the stronghold of the most reckless industrial exploiting of the working man.

Against Capital the working man has only one arm—the strike. But no strike can be successful when tens of thousands of soldiers and hundreds of guns are brought out in the streets as soon as the working man decides rather to starve than to submit to the arrogant demands of the capitalists.

The Russian people—the working men—having compelled the autocrat to abdicate his despotic power, must compel him now to give body to his abdication by sending away the troops upon which rest his power and the power of bureaucracy, the power of unbridled capitalism.

The people must arm itself; otherwise the Czar, the bureaucrats and the capitalists will crush it down.

They are right, therefore, those who now carry the red flag in the streets, claiming an amnesty, the sending away of the troops, and the arming of the people.

However, at the same time, the Russian working men must not forget **their own demands.** To guarantee the individual against police arbitrariness is necessary for all. But he who works and produces riches with his own hands requires something else.

When the working men began their general strike, they demanded the eight-hour day, an increase of their wages, insurance against illness and old age, and schools for their children. These demands are very modest. The working man's rights are wider than that. But, Why are even these modest demands already forgotten?

In the year 1848 the working men of Paris and Vienna also trusted the classes. Once they had obtained the promulgation of a Constitution in ruling Vienna and a Republic in France, they agreed to wait three months in the expectation that measures would be taken which would grant them something besides the freedom of speech and meeting which they had already taken themselves de facto.

And three months later the blood of the working men was freely running in the streets of both Paris and Vienna. And upon their corpses the middle classes built their power, which lasts till this day!

Russian working men! don't forget this lesson! If you are compelled tomorrow, after the Constitution has been proclaimed, to return to the factories the same slaves as you have been before, then you will have been betrayed in the same way as your brothers were betrayed in Vienna and in Paris.

Don't expect anything from would-be saviours. But in every factory, every building yard, every workshop, and every mine, **establish yourselves the order of things which, by common accord, you will find proper to establish.** But remember this: Don't allow others to interfere! It is your affair, and you have to settle it.

Accomplish yourselves a revolution in the organization of labor as you have accomplished it in the general administration of the Russian State.

Don't trust those who will tell you: "Not yet! It is too soon!" No, it is not too soon; it is just the time for it.

The working men of all the civilized world will be with you if you boldly take upon yourselves that great task.

Long live the Social Revolution—in Russia and everywhere!

Peter Kropotkin.

Bromley, Kent, Nov. 3, 1905.

PETER KROPOTKIN.

(Continued from Page 1.)

Napoleon, or a Tchinghis Khan had conquered Europe, traced the lines with a compass, and issued the order for the trains to run, in which case we should still be traveling by diligence?

Your network of railroads is the work of the human mind proceeding from the simple to the complex, through the spontaneous efforts of those interested, and it is in this way that all the great enterprises of our age have been carried through. We pay, it is true, the manager of these enterprises too high a price—an excellent reason for doing away with their profits, but not for intrusting the management of the railroads of Europe to a European government.

THE COMING OF OXYGEN.

Yet another scientific discovery which promises an early revolution in general industry is announced. M. George Claude, a famous French experimentalist, has, it is stated, succeeded in separating oxygen and nitrogen from liquid air in such a way that both these elements are obtained pure and free from each other. This is done by transforming liquid air (Professor Dewar's discovery) back into the gascous state, in the process of which the oxygen and nitrogen exaporate at different stages and may be captured. It is declared that by this means abundant oxygen may be cheaply obtained, and by its use temperatures of a degree hitherto impossible in manufacturing processes may be made available. At a comparatively small cost "metal may be made to run like water," and a complete change, not only in metal working industries, but in the lighting of houses and public health, may be cheaply effected. Pure oxygen may be used in fires, smoke abolished, and the air of towns wholesomely refrigerated.

Let us hail the discovery. Science speeds forward apace with healing and blessings, but, alas! monopoly grabs them out of her hands. This new discovery also will be used as a new means of capitalist exploitation of the earth and air and human life.

If anything is known as to crime and punishment, it is that punishments have little or no effect to lessen crimes. Were not this the case, the sea of blood that has been spilled, the ocean of tears that have been shed, the wails and sighs and sufferings of the endless train of victims that has ever been moving onward to gallows and block and prison pen, long ago would have banished crime from the world.—Clarence Darrow.

If drinking is the cause of poverty, is it not strange that the people who drink the most and the costliest liquor are not poor but rich? What really causes general poverty is not the voluntary expenditures of the working class for five-cent beer; it is the involuntary expenditures they must make and the insufficient wages they are forced to accept in order that a parasitic class may drink the five dollar wine.—The Public.

Subscribe for The Liberator.

A. R. PARSONS' SPEECH.

(Continued from Page 1.)

I will not make a statement but what will be in accord with the facts, and what I do say is said for the purpose of refreshing your memory and asking you to look at both sides of this matter and view it from the standpoint of reason and common sense.

Now, the money-makers, the business men, those people who deal in stocks and bonds, the speculators and employers, all that class of men known as the money-making class, have no conception of this labor question; they don't understand what it means. To use the street parlance, with many of them it is a difficult matter to "catch onto" it, and they are perverse also; they will have no knowledge of it. They don't want to know anything about it, and they won't hear anything about it, and they propose to club, lock up, and, if necessary, strangle those who insist on their hearing this question. Can it be any longer denied that there is such a thing as the labor question in this country?

I am an Anarchist. Now strike! But hear me before you strike. What is Socialism, or Anarchism? Briefly stated, it is the right of the toilers to the free and equal use of the tools of production, and the right of the producers to their product. That is Socialism. The history of mankind is one of growth. It has been evolutionary and revolutionary. The dividing line between evolution and revolution, or that imperceptible boundary line where one begins and the other ends can never be defined. Who believed at the time that our forefathers tossed the tea into the Boston harbor that it meant the first revolt of the revolution separating this continent from the dominion of George III. and founding this Republic here in which we, their descendants, live today? Evolution and revolution are synonymous. Evolution is the incubatory state of revolution. The birth is the revolution—its process the evolution. What is the history of man with regard to the laboring classes?

Originally the earth and its contents were held in common by all men. Then came a change brought about by violence, robbery and wholesale murder, called war. Later, but still way back in history, we find that there were but two classes in the world—slaves and masters. Time rolled on and we find a labor system of serfdom. This serf-labor system existed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and throughout the world the serf had a right to the soil on which he lived. The lord of the land could not exclude him from its use. But with the discovery of America and the developments which followed that discovery and its settlement, a century or two afterwards, the gold found in Mexico and Peru by the invading hosts of Cortez, and Pizarro who carried back to Europe this precious metal, infused new vitality into the stagnant commercial blood of Europe and set in motion those wheels which have rolled on and on, until today commerce covers the face of the earth—time is annihilated and distance is known no more. Following the abolition of the serfdom system was the establishment of the wage-labor system. This found its fruition, or birth, rather, in the French revolution of 1789 and 1793. It was then for the first time that civil and political liberty was established in Europe.

We see, by a mere glance back into history, that the sixteenth century was engaged in a struggle for religious freedom and the right of conscience—mental liberty. Following that, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was the struggle throughout France which resulted in the establishment of the Republic and the founding of the right of political liberty. The struggle today, which follows on in the line of progress, and in the logic of events, the 'industrial problem, which is here in this court-room, of which we are the representatives, and of which the State's Attorney has said we were, by the grand jury selected because we were the leaders of it, and are to be punished and consigned to an ignominious death for that reason, that the wage slaves of Chicago and of America may be horrified, terror-stricken, and driven like "rats back to their holes," to hunger, slavery, misery, and death. The industrial question, following on in the natural order of events, the wage system of industry, is now up for consideration; it presses for a hearing; it demands a solution; it cannot be throttled by this District Attorney, nor all the District Attorneys upon the soil of America.

Now, what is this labor question which these gentlemen treat with such profound contempt, which these distinguished, "honorable" gentlemen would throttle and put to ignominious death, and hurry us like "rats to our holes?" What is it? You will pardon me if I exhibit some feeling? I have sat here for two months, and these men have poured their vituperations out upon my head and I have not been permitted to utter a single word in my own defense. For two months they have sat here and spit like adders the vile poison of their tongues, and if men could have been placed in a mental inquisition and tortured to death, these men would have succeeded here now—vilified, misrepresented, held in loathsome contempt without a chance to speak or contradict a word. Therefore, if I show emotion, it is because of this, and if my comrades and colleagues with me here have spoken in such strains as these, it is because of this. Pardon us. Look at it from the right standpoint.

What is this labor question? It is not a question of emotion; the labor question is not a question of sentiment; it is not a religious matter; it is not a political problem; no, sir, it is a stern economic fact, a stubborn and immovable fact. It has, it is true, its emotional phase; it has its sentimental, religious, political aspects, but the sum total of this question is the bread and butter question, the how and the why we will live and earn our daily bread. This is the labor movement. It has a scientific basis. It is founded upon fact, and I have been to considerable pains in my researches of well-known and distinguished authors on this question to collect and present to you briefly what this question is and what it springs from. I will first explain to you briefly what capital is.

(Continued next week.)

A NECKTIE PARTY.

The male portion of The Liberator Group's neckties are beginning to look shabby after the winter's service and they want new ones, so also are a good many other men's ties, so The Liberator Group has arranged with a number of young girls to supply this demand. In other words The Liberator is going to give a necktie party. It is going to be arranged in this way, all the girls will bring nice new, latest style spring neckties and these will be auctioned off. Of course, every young man (and old ones too), wants a spring, Easter tie, and of course he will buy it at The Liberator party instead of in a store. Our New Year's social was a great success, but our necktie party is going to be still nicer, so don't fail to attend. The date and hall will be announced next week in The Liberator.

The masses are so hypnotized that, though they see what is continually going on around them, they do not understand what it means. They see the unceasing care kings, emperors, presidents bestow on disciplined armies, see the parades and manoeuvers they hold, and of which they boast to one another, and the people eagerly crowd to see how their own brothers, dressed up in bright-colored, glittering clothes, are turned into machines to sound of drums and trumpets, and who, obedient to the shouting of one man, all make the same movements; and they do not understand the meaning of it all. Yet the meaning of such drilling is very clear and simple. It is preparing for murder. It means the stupefying of men in order to convert them into instruments for murdering.—Tolstoi.

CORRESPONDENCE

MY IDEAL OF AN ANARCHISTIC STATE.

Editor Liberator:

In your issue of Dec. 3, A. A. invites discussion on the subject of Compensation in a Free Society—a subject which must be nearest the hearts of those who are interested in a free community.

While there are many points and suggestions made by A. A. with which I fully agree, on the whole I would take issue with him on the most important of all, namely, that which pertains to property and values "which all these terms imply." In fact, A. A. depicts more of a socialistic than an anarchistic state of affairs, as his advocacy of Labor Exchange notes or certificates clearly indicates. While such a system no doubt has its advantages over those now in vogue, it does not strike the prevailing evils at the root.

In the first place the term "compensation" does not strike me very favorably. It has too much of a mercenary or mercantile ring about it; sounds too much as if any one under an anarchistic regime was to receive pay or a money consideration for whatever labor he performs for either himself or for the community at large. This is indeed the whole tenor of A. A.'s communication, as is most clearly seen in his concluding paragraph wherein he refers to the exchange of property, for example, between the machinists' and shoemakers' groups, the evil of which he proposes to correct by the issuance of time-notes, labor-notes or certificates, which are to serve, as a matter of course, in the capacity of money, enabling the holder or possessor (!) to procure any article or amount of property (!) he pleases. Now where is the advantage of such a system of exchange over the present one? If there is any, I fail to perceive it. Would it not afford the same opportunity for the illegitimate accumulation of property as the present systems? The shrewdest in the communities would manage to get possession of the greatest number of these certificates of labor performed by exchanging them for the goods in their possession, and thus a regular money-monger traffic would be again established. And, as he correctly admits, "it only needs a group to undertake the issuance of such certificates and the circulation is very simple, requiring no extra functionaries."

We have such "groups" now in the form of gold, silver and paper-money manufacturers galore, but under an Anarchistic state of affairs the world will have no use for them. On the contrary, to abolish them, root, branch and all, should be the first aim and object of Anarchists, for it is to these very money-making groups that nearly all of the existing evils can be traced. What but for the accumulation of property and its representative, money, were all forms of government originally instituted—the object being the rule of the strong and mighty over the mentally weaker masses; to live on "the fat of the land" at the latter's expense? What but the issuance of money, be it in whatsoever form it will, metal or paper, enabled, and still enables, a comparatively few to seize from the intellectually weaker, though numerically stronger masses, lands and chattels untold and hold them within their greedy grasp, though the multitudes starve for them! That's what money has done for the world, and will continue to do whether it be in the form of gold or silver or labor notes, bonds or other certificates of value. We will have no use for them under an ideal state of Anarchism.

Under such a (self-) government no accumulation of property by individuals will be permissible—as I understand it. Why should anyone desire more property in the form of lands, goods or other chattels than he or she can possibly need? There is the point—the whole aim and object of Anarchism in a nutshell! Is there anything unreasonable, impracticable or visionary about it? If so, I would like to have some one point it out. If every one is provided with the comforts and necessities of life, what more can he or she desire? These commodities are furnished to all by the community, and all this is expected of them in return is the performance of such labor as they are best adapted for. If for any reason they are unable to perform work, no labor is required or expected of them.

Will there be any to think their allotted labor or the work assigned to them? I answer, no, for the reason that the proper education will disincline every person against the neglect of their proper duties. Thus all will be perfectly free to act just as they will, **but they all WILL to do right**, to act only in consonance with the welfare of the community—to respect the rights of others the same as they do their own. Under such a regime what need is there of labor exchange notes or other certificate of indebtedness for labor performed? Each individual will be supplied with all he needs—for the asking. No need for stinting, for the bounties of Nature enable all to live in comfort, if not in luxury. Greed, the creator of want, the producer of crime, would vanish from the face of the earth under an Anarchistic system of self-government. There is nothing Utopian about this view. It would be established today or tomorrow if the toiling masses would understand the simple principle involved. But avarice keeps them in ignorance, in slavery, in misery, in poverty. When will the light dawn on them.

H. W.

Midale, Sask., Canada,
Jan. 7, 1906.

Editor of The Liberator:

Again writing to show the condition of the farmers, I wish to make the remark that even if I in my former letter wrote about creameries and butter, I certainly did not color the condition of the farmers, as if they were right in the butter, as an old saying goes. Neither can I this time afford any other kind of color upon the condition of the farmers than truth and facts.

From my mentioning of creameries and butter making, the readers consequently will understand that in the communities of my former place of farming in North Dakota, the farmers were raising fairly large herds of cattle, so that when the farmers' better half or children returned home from the creameries they also had to help the "old man" with his work at home—"hustle ala life or death"—for which the combined struggle of the family during the year, netted in presumably not much more than a couple of Thanksgiving turkeys and a few articles of Christmas Santa Claus toys for the children, after the necessary bills to P. Kuriko, J. J. Hill and so-called local merchant princes were settled—with the latter parties however, sometimes in the business way of "carry me over for another year." There is little or nothing left for the farmer.

I should by right have written a few words more as regards the farmers' business of cattle raising, but to cut my article a little shorter I may as well let is pass till I begin with my articles upon the subject of voting cattle.

At my former place of farming, as well as that of the present, I belonged to the class of farmers who were raising number one hard wheat (mixed with a little smut), but like the rest of the farmers a good many times I was fool enough to sell said grade of my wheat to the elevator companies for "no grade or rejected." That however is not all the fun of it, as I will show from experience of my own, as follows: There being two different elevator companies at that place, buying and shipping grain, may call the one "Light Weight Elevator Co." and the other 'Fair Weight Elevator Co." Anyway some few years ago it happened I, from my own farm, direct from the threshing machine, hauled a couple of loads of wheat, 55-56 bushels machine measure, to the Fair Weight Elevator grain buyer, and got from him net weight in bushels, as many as it was by the machine measure, of course not a bit more. I hauled also a few loads for some of my neighbors, in like circumstances as my own, and got from same grain buyer same result as for my own wheat. At that time I was not in the least dissatisfied, but just the same, thought I might as well try the grain buyer of the Light Weight Elevator Co. also with a few loads of my wheat and sell him a share of the same. Having hauled and sold a couple of loads of my wheat to the grain buyer I decided not to deal any more with him, as I got on 55-56 bushel loads of wheat, machine measure, only 50-51 bushels net, or five bushels less than from his opponent grain buyer, and so I hauled and sold the balance of my grain to the grain buyer of the Fair Weight Elevator Co. The Light Weight grain buyer of course did not like very well my action of my own business, so one day when I came into town with a load of wheat he asked me why he could not get from me what he considered to be his share of my grain, as between himself and his opponent grain buyer; to which I replied, as it truly was, that I got 5 bushels less from him on every 55 bushel load of wheat than from his opponent, and I therefore considered it to be too much of a 'rob a feller" business out of my own pockets. He thereupon kind of innocently excused himself by saying "I can't see what the matter is, but it certainly must be some kind of trouble with the scale which I had no knowledge of," and said he would examine his scale, and if he found something was the matter with it, he would have it fixed and corrected. The next day he told me that he had found out what was the trouble with his scale—his scale "caught on a nail" he said—but all was now fixed and all right. I did not say very many words in reply, but hinted to him indirectly plain enough that I considered he already had enough of my wheat," as long as he did not buy more than 50 out of every 55 bushel loads of wheat, and that his scale might continue to catch from other parties, not quite as sharp as myself.

Why, of course it's no wonder
We farmers do fail,
As our products they plunder
With scales "caught on a nail."

E. N. Ling.

Atchison, January 2, 1906.

To the Editor of The Liberator:

In number 14, A. A. said that he wants a labor note or certificate, to use the same as cash money. If he wants to put the same thing in its place, such action would be unnecessary work. You could accumulate said labor notes just the same as you do money now, and the labor notes would represent so much in the warehouse, therefore whatever it represents, if it is two hours of food or anything else, would be in a standstill. What a system of solidarity and humanity would that be, while weak and old people would be in need. Your accumulation would be nothing else than your private property. Under Anarchistic Communism, everything would be in a commune. Therefore machinery would belong to all the members of the community and every one would have access to it, and no one could make anything for his private property. Everyone would have a right to satisfy his desires to the full extent of plentiful things, but if eggs were scarce, or any other things of that kind, our sentiments of solidarity would direct such food to children and the sick first. No money nor anything in its place would be wanted under Anarchist communism; nothing but a register of what is needed and of what is produced, so that production may be kept up to the level of need. And machinery employed to the utmost in this way, each will give to society all that his strength permits, until enough is produced for every one, and each will take all that he needs, limiting his need by retaliation only on those things of which there is not yet plenty for every one. To those who make the remark to work in the mines, etc., when ventilation and light will be installed and all other improvements of machinery, I believe there won't be much trouble that way. If there is, each one will have to take his share, but as Peter Kropotkin explains in his "Conquest of Bread," the possibility is that such things won't exist.

L. Aleonard.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Progressive Library, 106 Forsyth St., New York City.

The best radical literature in all modern languages, free to read. Reading room open from 11 a. m. to 11 p. m. every day in the year. The Progressive Library Group meets every Monday, and has free discussions every Thursday evening, English lectures every Sunday afternoon and Jewish lectures every Sunday evening. The lectures are accompanied by a musical entertainment.

Liberty Group, San Francisco.

Liberty Group of San Francisco meets every two weeks; next meetings, Dec. 23rd and Jan. 6th, at 417 Post St.

Liberator Group, New York.

The Liberator Group of New York meets every first and third Sunday of the month at 415 Grand St., first floor, at 8 p. m. sharp.

Those interested in the English propaganda are earnestly requested to come to our meetings.

Progressive Library Circle.

The Progressive Literary Circle meets Thursday evenings at 379 S. Halsted St.

Social Science League Sunday Night Meetings.

The Social Science League, public meetings every Sunday night at 8 p. m. Room 913 Masonic Temple. Speakers: Hulda Potter Loomis—January 14. J. Howard Moore—The World is Growing Better — January 21. Jacob E. LeBosky—The Russian Situation—January 28. Free discussion after each lecture.

The Liberator Group.

The Liberator Group meets Sunday, Jan. 14th, at 2:30 p. m. sharp. A general discussion of current topics. Good speakers. All are invited. Corner Halsted and Maxwell Sts., entrance 275 Maxwell St.

Dance and Social Given by Social Science League.

Do not fail to attend the social and dance given for the benefit of our paper, The Demonstrator (We are pleased to state that The Liberator is not "our paper," but belongs to all alike.—L. E. P.) At Fohey's Hall, 235 S. Western Ave., near Van Buren St., Saturday evening, Jan. 27, 1906. Large program of entertainers. Admission 10 cents.

Cigar Makers' Union of I. W. W.

Cigarmakers' Local Union No. 158 I. W. W. will meet every Friday night, corner Maxwell and Jefferson Sts. Discussion. All are invited.

FIRST GRAND PUZZLE CONTEST AND BALL!

given by the

PROGRESS CLUB

At West Chicago Club House,
50 Throop Street,
SUNDAY EVE, JANUARY 21, 1906.

Grand Entree at 8:00.

Tickets 25 Cents a Person.
Music by Lawrence.

The Bauern Ball

OF THE PROGRESSIVE LIBRARY.

will be held on

FRIDAY NIGHT, FEB. 2, '06, at GRAND AMERICAN HALL, 7 and 9 Second Ave., New York City.

ADMISSION 25 CENTS.

LIFE OF
Albert R. Parsons

SECOND EDITION

With A History of the Labor Movement in America

Also sketches of the lives of his fellow victims, together with a full and accurate description of the Haymarket meeting.

READ THIS ACCOUNT OF A DIABOLICAL CONSPIRACY OF CAPITALISTS:

"A surprisingly temperate and strong presentation of evidence showing that Parsons was a victim of popular furore. The figure of Parsons walking into Court of his own free will, and there condemned to death under unusual circumstances, has dramatic interest which will serve to keep the book alive."—Chicago Record Herald, Feb. 10, 1905.

"The hanging of the Anarchists in Chicago is now sufficiently a matter of history to permit its discussion without the heat of prejudice that a frightened capitalist press had thrown upon it at the time of its occurrence. The pardon of Governor Altgeld, with his reasons for granting it, which are included in this work, has shown with absolute certainty that the men who were hanged upon that November day in 1887 were murdered for no other reason than because victims were needed to frighten the working class back into humble submission.*** It shows beyond doubt that the present ruling class will stop at nothing in their endeavors to terrorize those who threaten their rulership.*** The tremendous and terrible facts that are told in this book reach a dramatic height that thrills and enthralls the reader."—International Socialist Review, July 1, 1904.

A BEAUTIFUL CLOTH BOUND 353 OCTAVE PAGE BOOK, ARTISTICALLY ILLUSTRATED, PRICE $1.25.
BOUND IN HALF MOROCCO, $1.75.

Every thinker and student should have this book in their possession

Order Direct from the Publisher

Mrs. Lucy E. Parsons
1777 N. Troy St., - - CHICAGO, ILL.

COMRADES, FELLOW WORKERS, FRIENDS,

Please fill out the following subscription blank and forward to us just as soon as you possibly can:—

To Liberator Publishing Group,
466 W. Van Buren St., Chicago, Ill.

I hereby subscribe to The Liberator for the term of one year from date hereof at the rate of one dollar per year.

Signed .....

Street No. .....

City or Town .....

State .....

Date .....190....

Comrades, On you depends the existence of "LIBERATOR."